

Appl. No. : 10/817,551
Filed : April 2, 2004

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

In Figure 6, please amend p_i and p_{i+1} with the P_i and P_{i+1} , respectively. Replacement Sheet for each drawing being amended is accompanied with this paper.

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action dated June 26, 2007. As set forth above, Claims 3 and 5 have been amended, and Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled without prejudice. The specification and the drawings have been amended. Upon the entry of the amendments, Claims 3-5 are pending in this application. No new matter is added by the amendments. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Discussion of Allowable Claims 3-5

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's note that Claims 3-5 would be allowable if amended to independent form. In reply, Applicant has amended Claims 3 and 5 in independent form to incorporate all the limitations of their base and intervening claims. Claim 4 remains to depend from Claim 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3-5 are in condition for allowance.

Discussion of the Objection to the Specification

Tables 1 and 2 and four paragraphs in the specification have been amended to correct typographical errors in equations as the Examiner suggested in the Office Action. The corrections to the specification add no new matter. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Reply to Examiner's Request for Further References

In reply to the Examiner's request for any further references, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant is not aware of any further references that are relevant to fuzzy entropy and fixed point iteration and pertinent to patentability.

Discussion of the Objection to the Claims

Claim 5 has been amended to correct typographical errors as the Examiner suggested in the Office Action. The corrections to Claim 5 add no new matter. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

Discussion of the Amendments to the Drawings

Figure 6 has been amended to correct typographical errors. The correction to Figure 6 adds no new matter.

Discussion of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sahoo et al. (Optical Engineering, Vol. 37, July 1977) and under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art and Strang (Calculus, Wellesley Cambridge Press). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner and respectfully submits that Sahoo et al. does not anticipate these claims and that these claims are patentable over the applicant's admitted prior art and Strang. However, solely in order to expedite the prosecution to early issuance of a patent, Applicant has canceled Claims 1 and 2 without prejudice. Thus, the rejections to Claims 1 and 2 are moot.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 10/17/07

By: 

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550